

IBM Docket No. GB920000079US1

Applicant notes that the wording of claims 23 – 25, specifically “providing”, is broad enough to include the method of making applicant’s claims 1 – 20. Furthermore, applicant’s step of providing is also broad enough to include of the sub-steps of “laminating” or “adhering” as suggested by the Examiner. The “product” of applicant’s claims 1 – 20 is not made by a different process, but in fact is made by the process as claimed in applicant’s claims 23 – 25. Therefore, since grouping 1, claims 1 – 20, is only made by grouping 3, claims 23 – 25, the restriction requirement is improper as to separation of claims 1 – 20 and 23 – 25.

In view of the remarks herein, applicant respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the groupings of the restriction requirement and examine claims 1- 20 and 23- 25 as a single grouping. If the Examiner wishes to discuss the application further, or if additional information would be required, the undersigned will cooperate fully to assist in the prosecution of this application.

Please charge any fee necessary to enter this paper and any previous paper to deposit account 09-0468.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Derek S. Jennings  
Registered Patent Agent / Patent Engineer  
Reg. No. 41,473

IBM Corporation  
Intellectual Property Law Department  
P. O. Box 218  
Yorktown Heights, New York 10598  
Telephone No.: (914) 945-2144

Serial No. 09/683,342

2